

**DRAFT REMARKS - NOT FOR ENTRY**

**IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE**

In re the Application of:	Application No.: 10/743,158
Einat Amitay	
	Confirmation No.: 7754
Filed: 12-12-03	
	Art Unit: 2167
For: Enhanced Document Search	
Engine	Examiner: Pham, Michael

---

Commissioner for Patents  
PO Box 1450  
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Sir:

In response to an Official Action dated 16 March 2010, Applicant respectfully submits the following remarks for discussion in a telephone interview, to be scheduled. This application contains claims 37-45, 56-63 and 65, all of which were rejected in the Official Action under 35 U.S.C. § 102 and 35 U.S.C. § 103 variously over Cole et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,571,239 (Cole), Prokoph, U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2002/0091671 (Prokoph), and Kim et al., U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2003/0208482 (Kim). Applicant proposes to discuss the grounds of rejection with respect to a new proposed independent claims 66.

## **DRAFT REMARKS - NOT FOR ENTRY**

### **Claim (Proposed)**

66. (new) A method of searching for documents, comprising the steps of:

providing a document index for a collection of documents to be searched, the document index comprising terms that occur in the collection;

accepting user queries in a search engine;

responsively to the queries searching the document index with the search engine to identify documents of the collection that satisfy the queries, respectively; and

adding the queries to the respectively identified documents as metadata.

### **Argument.**

Cole proposes a search technique in which associations between database objects and keywords can be modified in order to maintain an up-to-date classification of the database objects. However Cole differs from the invention claimed in independent claim 66 significantly.

Cole discloses modification of an index of keywords (e.g., Fig. 2, blocks 255, 260). Moreover, modification of a master or auxiliary keyword index is described in detail with respect to Fig. 3 (col. 4, lines 40-53). In contrast, independent claim 66 recites modification of the documents themselves by "adding the respective queries to the identified documents as metadata". As noted in the Inventor's Declaration under Rule 132, previously

## **DRAFT REMARKS - NOT FOR ENTRY**

submitted, embedded metadata of this sort could be discovered by subsequent searches by other users who may subsequently include the language of the metadata in their own queries (this is claimed in Dependent claim 69). As a consequence, highly relevant documents with respect to the queries can be found more quickly. Applicant is unable to find this feature in Cole.

Kim is directed to improvements in ranking data identified by queries. As the Examiner notes, Kim teaches ranking pages retrieved by searching a database index, and not concerned with facilitating subsequent recovery of the documents by searching modified documents. Modification of Cole by the teachings of Kim would not lead the ordinarily skilled person to achieve the invention claimed in claim 66.

Prokoph can be distinguished from the claimed invention in combination with the other references cited by the Examiner. Prokoph discloses a document retrieval indexing technique which is substantially different from the invention claimed in claim 66. As outlined in Fig. 3, Prokoph creates extracts of documents, and indexes the extracts for use by a search engine. Prokoph does not disclose addition of metadata to the documents themselves. A person ordinarily skilled in the art would therefore not follow Prokoph in combination with Cole and Kim to attempt to make the invention claimed in claim 66.